

CON 12-15
doc # 5920

From: Tami Rice
To: John Gaines
Date: 4/10/2006 7:50:39 AM
Subject: Re: Clinton Engines / New Horizon FS

John,

Thanks for the updates. It would be acceptable for New Horizon FS-Onslow to abandon off site monitoring wells due to the status of the site.

I look forward to receiving the hard copies of the Clinton Engines-Maquoketa work plan.

Thanks again,
Tami

Tami S. Rice
Environmental Specialist
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Contaminated Sites Section
502 East 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Ph: (515) 281-4420
Fax: (515) 281-8895

>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 4/6/2006 10:10 AM >>>
Just wanted to let you know that New Horizon FS would like to abandon the off site monitoring wells, at this time they would like to maintain the on-site monitoring wells in case of some future release.

As discussed, the Maquoketa City Council had a meeting and I received word from Mr. Brian Wagner that the city intends to move forward with the project. For your reference I've attached a copy of the work plan text, a hard copy with diagrams will follow shortly.

Thank you,

John Gaines

40299328



Superfund

From: <jgaines@machlink.com>
To: "Tami Rice" <Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us>
Date: 3/17/2006 9:49:24 AM
Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan

Thank you Tami,
Lots of computer problems, and hopefully will be up and running by Monday
- the electronic copy of the work plan is currently not accessible, but
luckily did print out a paper copy for mark up.

I was proposing an 5035 field preservation and 8260 for full VOC scan,
this would include the compounds present in OA-1. I didn't see anything
in the previous reports or correspondence regarding concerns with diesel
fuel or metals so I had not intended to conduct additional assessment for
those compounds. If this is in error, please let me know.

Thank you, John

> John,
> I'm sorry for not responding sooner. What I suggest to sample for on
> this site is to analyze for the constituents found during the initial
> sampling (i.e. VOCs, OA-1, OA-2, metals) and then determine the extent
> of those constituents throughout the site. Vertical profiling of soils
> would be useful especially if excavation may occur at the site, but
> horizontal extent is also important.
>
> Be careful to ensure the laboratory detection limits are below our
> statewide standards as this seems to be a common problem we come
> across.
>
> If this would make it easier, I could review a "draft" work plan before
> you submit the final plan.
>
> Thanks,
> Tami
>
>
>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/14/2006 9:47 AM >>>
> Thank you,
> Reading through the regulations on the LRP, actually looks like a very
> interesting program. I have a couple of groundwater modeling programs
> I use
> - one termed TACO, written by a consultant out of Virginia and of
> course the
> Tier 2 Modeling software, which may not be that appropriate for our
> chemicals of concern. I assume in preparation for these potential
> models,
> you would encourage collection of organic content at a couple of
> locations
> as well as potential vertical profiling of soil impact.
>
> John
>
> BTW, Funny how the modflow software is now a pay deal when it was
> originally

> free as it was developed with our tax dollars and written by the USGS.
> I
> think there are some earlier versions floating around which may still
> be
> public access.
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Tami Rice [mailto:Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us]
> Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 9:40 AM
> To: jgaines@machlink.com
> Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan
>

> John,
>

> Our section does not really work with any of the groundwater modeling
> software (LRP might but I have yet to review a LRP site) so you are
> able
> to use whatever version of modflow you want.
>

> I realize that the LRP has things specifically spelled out as it is
> more "guided" than the typical assessments we review. Since the
> client
> is not in the LRP, you can use those rules as guidance in putting
> together a work plan, but plume mapping is not required at this stage.
>

> Basically what we need is just a glorified Phase II. By this I mean
> that we need to expand on the previous sampling that was conducted on
> the site in order to get a better handle on what the conditions are at
> the site and to what sort of extent the contamination exists.
>

> Thanks,
> Tami
>

> Tami S. Rice
> Environmental Specialist
> Iowa Department of Natural Resources
> Contaminated Sites Section
> 502 East 9th Street
> Des Moines, Iowa 50319
> Ph: (515) 281-4420
> Fax: (515) 281-8895
>

>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/13/2006 11:10 PM >>>
> Quick question, reading the LRP rules, what version of modflow or mt3d
> is
> the IDNR using? There is some freeware on a few boards; others are in
> the
> 3.5k range - ouch. Thank you, John
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Tami Rice [mailto:Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us]
> Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 3:25 PM
> To: jgaines@machlink.com
> Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan

>
> That works fine for me. I look forward to it
>
>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/8/2006 3:22 PM >>>>
> Looks like tomorrow will be better - phone is now clear. Morning
> better for
> you? John
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tami Rice [mailto:Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us]
> Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 1:22 PM
> To: jgaines@machlink.com
> Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan
>
> No, this appears to be one of Matt Culp's sites. His phone number is
> 515-242-5087 if you would like to talk to him directly.
>
>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/8/2006 1:15 PM >>>>
> I have another question - sorry our phones are tied up at the
> moment...but
> will try to call before you leave this afternoon.
>
> I was contacted by Gene Meyer, Meyer Oil Company. Reading through the
> one
> report he gave me it indicated he was in the contaminated sites
> section
> -
> this wouldn't happened to be one of yours as well?
> Facility Address:
> 2605 Blackhawk Street
> Davenport
> Scott County
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tami Rice [mailto:Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us]
> Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 12:49 PM
> To: jgaines@machlink.com
> Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan
>
> John,
>
> It may be much easier for me to discuss Maquoketa over the phone. My
> number is 515-281-4420 and my hours are 7-3:30 M-F.
>
>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/8/2006 11:36 AM >>>>
> Do you have time to talk about Maquoketa if I give you a call? Also
> is
> this
> site going to be in the contaminated sites or under LRP? I am certain
> the
> City would like to avoid the cost associated with entry and review
> fees
> under the LRP.
>
> Thank you, John

> Also what is your phone number?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Tami Rice [mailto:Tami.Rice@dnr.state.ia.us]

> Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2006 10:02 AM

> To: jgaines@machlink.com

> Subject: RE: Maquoketa Work Plan.

>

> Good morning John.

>

> I'm not sure I fully understand your question, but to clarify things a

> bit, I will be comparing the sampling results to the LRP statewide

> standards for soil and groundwater which can be found on our website

> as

> Table 1 and 2...

> <http://www.iowadnr.com/land/consites/lrp/conLRP.html>

>

> Since the LRP standards do not list any values for THE from OA-2

> analysis, I will compare those results to the Tier 1 Look-up Table in

> the Tier 1 Guidance.

>

> To answer your second question, I have not received any information on

> the Onslow site from you yet. I have received my lab results and am

> waiting for your final report to review.

>

> Hopefully I have answered your question sufficiently but if not, don't

> hesitate to ask for further clarification.

>

> Thanks,

> Tami

>

>

>

>>>> "John Gaines" <jgaines@machlink.com> 3/7/2006 5:28 PM >>>

> Would help if I could type your address. John

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: John Gaines [mailto:jgaines@machlink.com]

> Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 5:22 PM

> To: tami.rice@dnr.ia.state.us

> Subject: Maquoketa Work Plan

>

> Good afternoon Tami,

>

> First, my email service has been on the fritz, would appreciate any

> response

> to go to:

> jgaines@machlink.com - the service provider changed a routing number

> so

> most

> mail is lingering in cyberspace until they get this fixed (6 month

> problem).

>

> My question is on the use of the "State Wide Cleanup Standards", the

> groundwater concentrations appear pretty consistent with published

> concentrations for MCLs. The soil objectives appear primarily

- > associated
- > with numbers far less protective, perhaps where some institutional
- > control
- > exists - for example the objective for benzene is 73 mg/kg, where the
- > UST
- > section has set 0.54 mg/kg. Is there another set of concentrations
- > available for the chemicals of concern on this site that we should be
- > using
- > as a first screening?
- >
- >
- >
- > Hope all is well,
- >
- >
- >
- > John Gaines
- >
- > 563-441-2900
- >
- >
- >
- > Also did you ever get my numbers on the Onslö sampling - or results
- > back
- > from your laboratory?
- >